

**APPLICANTS' STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF EXAMINER INTERVIEW OF
MARCH 16, 2009**

The undersigned would like to thank Examiner Steadman for the courtesy extended in the telephonic interview conducted on March 16, 2009. The applicants' statement of the substance of the interview is presented herein.

Claims Discussed: 54

Prior Art Discussed: None

Agreement Reached: Not applicable

Substance of Interview:

In the interview, Examiner Steadman indicated that the amendments to the claims filed on March 6, 2009 had adopted the amendment proposed by the Examiner and would obviate the objections and rejections of claims made in the Final Office Action dated September 22, 2008. However, the Examiner would maintain the rejection of the reissue declaration as allegedly being defective. The Examiner suggested that the applicants use PTO-issued forms to submit the following documents:

1. Substitute Reissue Declaration by the Inventors;
2. Supplemental Declaration for Reissue Application to Correct "Errors" Statement (37 CFR 1.175);
3. Reissue Application: Consent of Assignee and Power of Attorney; and
4. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b)

The Examiner also indicated that the Substitute Reissue Declaration must keep the errors presented in the original Reissue Declaration and add any new errors that would support the reissue application. The undersigned indicated that applicants would consider the suggestions of the Examiner and proceed where appropriate.

**APPLICANTS' STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF EXAMINER INTERVIEW OF
MARCH 18, 2009**

The undersigned would like to thank Examiner Steadman for the courtesy extended in the telephonic interview initiated by him on March 18, 2009. The applicants' statement of the substance of the interview is presented herein.

Claims Discussed: None

Prior Art Discussed: None

Agreement Reached: Not applicable

Substance of Interview:

In the interview, Examiner Steadman maintained the rejection of the original reissue declaration filed on July 12, 2001 as allegedly defective, and the Examiner indicated that the substitute reissue declaration submitted on December 12, 2008 was unsigned. The undersigned indicated that the unsigned "substitute reissue declaration" sent to the Examiner via facsimile on December 12, 2008 along with an unsigned Assent by Assignee and Power of Attorney were not official papers filed at the Office, but were meant to be draft papers for the Examiner review as evidenced by no signature on the papers and the papers were not accompanied by any transmittal signed by the applicants or any patent attorney.

CONCLUSION

At least in view of the papers submitted with this transmittal, the reissue application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any issues related to this application.

In the event that the filing of this paper is deemed not timely, applicants petition for an appropriate extension of time. The Office is authorized to charge any fees, including the extension fee, or credit any overpayment regarding this application to Kenyon & Kenyon LLP **Deposit Account No. 11-0600.**

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 29, 2009

/King L. Wong/
King L. Wong
Registration No. 37,500

KENYON & KENYON LLP
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: (202) 220-4200
Fax: (202) 220-4201